UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,614	10/14/2003	Steven I. Carlson	CING-129	5089

39013 7590 11/24/2008
MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC
7601 LEWINSVILLE ROAD
SUITE 304
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
HOLLIDAY, JAIME MICHELE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/685,614	**Applicant(s)** CARLSON ET AL.
	Examiner JAIME M. HOLLIDAY	**Art Unit** 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5 and 7-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5 and 7-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants basically argue that Emery does not teach extracting abbreviated location information from amalgamated location information received from a caller, or transferring name information to a wireless device.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, because Emery et al. clearly, as stated in the previous Office Action, disclose an extended format (amalgamated) of a calling party identity that includes Location ID (abbreviated location information) and the registered name (name information) associated with the ANI or CLI of the caller (amalgamated name information comprises at least a portion of the abbreviated location information and at least a portion of the name information). In particular, a telephony message with calling number/name delivery includes calling number, calling name, location ID and indication (transferring name information to a wireless device) (col. 7 line 25- col. 8 line 15). The raw Location ID is delivered and can be decoded with on-premise equipment (extracting abbreviated location information from amalgamated location information); which is received in the extended format of the calling party identity.

Further, Applicants argue that Woodring does not teach logic that, when applied to a processor, results in servicing at least one request for caller name information by associating a caller number received via the at least one port with caller name information, and obtaining location information for the caller via the at least one port, and providing an amalgamation of a portion of the name information and the location information via the at least one port in response to the at least one request for caller name information.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, because Woodring, as stated in the previous Office Action, clearly discloses the SSP querying the SCP (network element), which includes the caller-id information (i.e., calling name) while the SSP includes the location information in the query message (servicing at least one request for caller name information by associating a caller number received via the one port with caller name information); the SCP provides the calling name information to the SSP. The server combines the information received from the SCP and user profile information to enhance caller ID service (obtaining location information; provide amalgamation of portion of name information and location information); the server may provide additional geographical information.

Applicants also argue that Barclay, as well as the other references used to over come depending claims, fails to disclose the amalgamated name and location information, and none of the prior art of record disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, because the Barclay reference is used to overcome the limitation "location information is abbreviated." Further, the secondary references were use to overcome limitations of depending claims. As discussed above, both the Emery and Woodring references teach amalgamated name and location information. The Emery and Woodring references, as modified by the secondary references, teach the claimed limitations as discussed above and shown in the previous office action.

Therefore, in view of the preceding explanation, Examiner maintains previous rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. **Claims 9, 10 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **Emery et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,727,057)**.

Consider **claim 9**, Emery et al. clearly show and disclose logic that, when applied to the processor, results in extracting abbreviated location information from amalgamated name and location information received for a caller, and retrieving the detailed location information for a caller, corresponding to abbreviated location information, wherein the amalgamated name and information comprises at least a portion of the abbreviated location information and at least a portion of the name information (For Calling Line Identification Telephone Service, the ANI or CLI is used to query a database to retrieve the callers registered name. With the Location ID enhancement, the location of the caller is also queried and then transmitted to the called party. The Location ID can be displayed to a subscriber as part of the calling party identity information (extended format) [amalgamated name and location information]. The information can be delivered as the raw Location ID, and the subscriber can use on-premise equipment to decode it, or the Location ID can be translated to an address prior to transmission. The Location ID may be sent as a number that is encoded within existing set of numbers transmitted by the mobile subscriber's device [abstract, col. 7 line 25- col. 8 line 22, line 62- col. 9 line 2]).

Consider **claim 10**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, Emery et al. further disclose logic that, when applied to the processor, results in locating a street address corresponding to the abbreviated location information (the Location ID can be translated to an address [col. 8 lines 15-22]).

Consider **claim 12**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, Emery et al. further disclose logic that, when applied to the processor, results in locating detailed location information configured by a user of the wireless device to correspond to the abbreviated location information (the information can be delivered as the raw Location ID, and the subscriber can use on-premise equipment to decode it [col. 8 lines 15-22]).

2. **Claims 14, 15, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **Woodring (Pub # U.S. 2003/0063730 A1)**.

Consider **claim 14**, Woodring clearly shows and discloses network element comprising: a processor; at least one port; a Gateway Mobile location Center, which comprises information about the location of a plurality of wireless devices that interact with a network; and logic that, when applied to the processor, results in associating a caller number received via the at least one port with caller name information, obtaining location information for the caller via the at least one port, and providing an amalgamation of a portion of the name information and the location information via the at least one port in response to the at least one request from caller name information (caller uses wireless telephone **13** and wireless connection **14** to call subscriber **20** via mobile switching center (MSC) **71**. The MSC is programmed to include the caller's geographic location information in a field of the initial address message (IAM) used to setup the call with SSP **31**. This call encounters trigger **31a** on subscriber's line **22** causing SSP to issue a query to SCP **33**. The SSP includes the location information in the query message for processing by the SCP. Such information could be based on the cell-site from which the caller is calling or if emergency 911 services are implemented, a more precise location could be provided. The SCP includes the caller-id information (i.e., calling number, calling name, and the physical location of the caller) in the message sent to server 40. The server may provide additional geographical information such as the postal zip code of the caller or the caller's county, state, or country. The server may provide a sort option to display information according to the date/time of the calls, by calling party number, by calling name, by geographic location, by area code, or other criteria [abstract, fig. 4, paragraphs 25, 26, 31]).

Consider **claim 15**, and **as applied to claim 14 above**, Woodring further discloses logic that, when applied to the processor, obtains settings for the caller via the at least one port and applies the settings to determine how to amalgamate the name information and location information (caller **10** may setup his or her user profile to provide enhanced caller information to one or more called parties. Whenever a caller calls a party (i.e., dials the party's DN) on a full access list, the called party receives or may access all of user 10's profile information. In contrast when a caller calls a party on a different access list, the called party will only receive or access that material specifically allowed by the user. The caller may implement such multi-levels of access to control how much information is provided to called parties. This may be useful, for example, if the user include highly personal information in his or her profile [paragraph 19]).

Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 14 above**, Woodring further discloses logic that, when applied to the processor, provides Calling Name Address Presentation including the name information and location information (an enhanced caller-id service wherein a server may provide a sort option to display information according to the date/time of the calls, by calling party number, by calling name, by geographic location, by area code, or other criteria [abstract, paragraph 26]).

Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 14 above**, Woodring further discloses logic that, when applied to the processor, locates a Friend Finder ID corresponding to the caller, and provides the Friend Finder ID via the at least one port to a GMLC (a caller providing or updating user profile information, such as a favorite quote, biographical information, and itinerary data for a planned trip. In another example, the user may include directions to his or her home or other detailed information. In yet another example, the user may provide an image of a business card or other identifying information [paragraph 18]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Woodring (Pub # U.S. 2003/0063730 A1)** in view of **Barclay et al. (Pub # U.S. 2003/0119522 A1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Woodring clearly shows and discloses a method comprising providing a caller number to a network element that associates name information with the caller number; the network element receiving location information for the caller (caller uses wireless telephone **13** and wireless connection **14** to call subscriber **20** via mobile switching center (MSC) **71**. This call encounters trigger **31a** on subscriber's line **22** causing SSP to issue a query to SCP **33**. The SSP includes the location information in the query message for processing by the SCP. Such information could be based on the cell-site from which the caller is calling or if emergency 911 services are implemented, a more precise location could be provided. The SCP includes the caller-id information (i.e., calling number, calling name, and the physical location of the caller) in the message sent to server [abstract, fig. 4, paragraphs 25, 26, 31]); the network element receiving information for the caller from a Gateway Mobile Location Center, which comprises information about the location of a plurality of wireless devices that interact with a network (The MSC is programmed to include the caller's geographic location information in a field of the initial address message (IAM) used to setup the call with SSP **31** [paragraphs 25, 26, 31]); the network element replacing at least a portion of the name information with the location information to create amalgamated location information and name information; and the network element providing the amalgamated location information and name information as a response to being provided the caller number (Server **40** may combine information received from the SCP and the user profile information received from user **10** with other information to enhance the caller-id service. For example, the server may provide additional geographical information such as the postal zip code of the caller or the caller's county, state, or country. Such information may be compiled and stored in database **45** and cross-referenced with the calling number and calling name information as needed. The server may provide a sort option to display information according to the date/time of the calls, by calling party number, by calling name, by geographic location, by area code, or other criteria [fig. 4, paragraphs 25, 26, 31]).

However, Woodring fails to specifically disclose that the location information is abbreviated.

In the same field of endeavor, Barclay et al. clearly show and disclose network element abbreviating the location information in the response (Location information may be provided as geodetic information, such as longitude and latitude, or utilizing non-geodetic or common nomenclature, such as street addresses/names, names of businesses, city/state names, and so forth [abstract, paragraph 15]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display location information in geodetic form as taught by Barclay et al. in the system of Woodring, in order to display information based on the granularity selected by the customer (Barclay et al.; paragraph 11).

Consider **claim 3**, Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition, Woodring further discloses network element combining the location information and name information according to settings for the caller (caller **10** may setup his or her user profile to provide enhanced caller information to one or more called parties. Whenever a caller calls a party (i.e., dials the party's DN) on a full access list, the called party receives or may access all of user 10's profile information. In contrast when a caller calls a party on a different access list, the called party will only receive or access that material specifically allowed by the user [paragraph 19]).

Consider **claim 4**, Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition, Woodring further discloses network element combining the location information and name information according to settings for a called party (the server may rearrange the information according to the subscriber's display preferences [paragraph 26]).

Consider **claim 7**, Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition, Woodring further discloses network element locating a Friend Finder ID associated with the caller, and providing the Friend Finder ID to the GMLC (a caller providing or updating user profile information, such as a favorite quote, biographical information, and itinerary data for a planned trip; the user may include directions to his or her home or other detailed information; the user may provide an image of a business card or other identifying information [paragraph 18]).

Consider **claim 8**, Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition, Woodring further discloses caller number provided to the network element as part of a Caller Name Address Presentation (CNAP) service (an enhanced caller-id service wherein a server may provide a sort option to display information according to the date/time of the calls, by calling party number, by calling name, by geographic location, by area code, or other criteria [abstract, paragraph 26]).

Consider **claim 16**, and **as applied to claim 14 above**, Woodring clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention, except that the location information is abbreviated.

In the same field of endeavor, Barclay et al. clearly show and disclose logic that, when applied to the processor, abbreviates the location information before providing the location information along with the name information via the at least one port (an apparatus and method provide location information for a calling party to a called party and/or provide a location for called party to a calling party. Location information may be provided as geodetic information, such as longitude and latitude, or utilizing non-geodetic or common nomenclature, such as street addresses/names, names of businesses, city/state names, and so forth [abstract, paragraph 15]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display location information in geodetic form as taught by Barclay et al. in the system of Woodring, in order to display information based on the granularity selected by the customer (Barclay et al.; paragraph 11).

5. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Woodring (Pub # U.S. 2003/0063730 A1)** in view of **Barclay et al. (Pub # U.S. 2003/0119522 A1)**, and in further view of **Gillespie (Pub # U.S. 2002/0137497 A1)**.

Consider **claim 5**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention, except that the network element a Line Information Database.

In the same field of endeavor, Gillespie clearly shows and discloses network element comprising a Line Information Database (LIDB) (a system for providing name information of a calling telecommunications device to a wireless called telecommunications includes at least one line information database and a local cache, each containing entries associating a calling number with name information. A signal transfer point determines which line information database contains name information associated with the calling telecommunications device and obtains the associated name information from the determined line information database [paragraph 17]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a LIDB retrieve a name associated with a calling number as taught by Gillespie in the system of Woodring, as modified by Barclay et al., in order to provide name information of a calling telephone device (Gillespie, paragraph 17).

6. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Emery et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,727,057)** in view of **Barclay et al. (Pub # U.S. 2003/0119522 A1)**.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, Emery et al. clearly show and disclose the claimed invention, except that the Location ID is displayed on a map.

In the same field of endeavor, Barclay et al. clearly show and disclose logic that, when applied to the processor, results in locating and displaying a location on a map corresponding to the abbreviated location information (Location information may be provided as geodetic information, such as longitude and latitude, or utilizing non-geodetic or common nomenclature, such as street addresses/names, names of businesses, city/state names, and so forth, (paragraph 15). One or more location format options are provided to the customer. For example, the customer may select a quantity of telephone numbers for which a map is chosen (e.g., for family members or friends) [abstract, paragraph 17]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display location information on a map as taught by Barclay et al. in the system of Emery et al., in order to display information based on the granularity selected by the customer (Barclay et al.; paragraph 11).

7. **Claim 13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Emery et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,727,057)** in view of **Gallant et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,802,468)**.

Consider **claim 13**, and **as applied to claim 9 above**, Emery et al. clearly show and disclose the claimed invention, except that location information is also stored on a SIM.

In the same field of endeavor, Gallant et al. clearly show and disclose Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) comprising the detailed location information (a broadcast message of each BTS includes grid coordinate information such as identifier fields defining the geographical location of the BTS or coordinates of the BTS within a specified coordinate system associated with the service area of the mobile communication system. The coordinates of the geographical address of the mobile station are stored in the HLR and in the SIM of the mobile station [abstract, col. 10 lines 10-18]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store a mobile station's geographical address on its SIM as taught by Gallant et al. in the system of Emery et al., in order to store and access geographical positioning data (Emery et al.; col. 2 lines 16-20).

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAIME M. HOLLIDAY whose telephone number is (571)272-8618. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jaime M Holliday/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617